



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,275	08/22/2001	Gerardo Castillo	PROTEO.P03	1974

7590 01/05/2006

PATRICK M. DWYER
PROTEOTECH, INC.
SUITE 114
1818 WESTLAKE AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98109

EXAMINER

CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1649

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/938,275	Applicant(s) CASTILLO ET AL.	
	Examiner Olga N. Chernyshev	Art Unit 1649	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 11, 12, 15, 20 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 11-12, 15, 20 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 22, 2005 has been entered.

Formal matters

2. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1649.

Response to Amendment

3. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended, claims 5, 19 and 21-22 have been canceled and claim 28 has been added as requested in the amendment filed on November 22, 2005. Following the amendment, claims 1, 4, 11-12, 15, 20 and 28 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 1, 4, 11-12, 15, 20 and 28, in so far as they are directed to the elected species of SEQ ID NO: 3 (see Paper No. 8) are under examination in the instant office action.

4. The Text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Any objection or rejection of record, which is not expressly repeated in this action has been overcome by Applicant's response and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1, 4, 11-12, 15, 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of inhibiting beta-amyloid protein fibril formation by administration of laminin or polypeptides specifically recited in claim 15, does not reasonably provide enablement for the use of any fragment of laminin or of the polypeptides recited in claim 15. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 1, 4, 11-12, 15, 20 and 28 are directed to methods of using laminin and its fragments to inhibit the formation of beta-amyloid protein. However, the instant specification fails to provide enough guidance for one skilled in the art on how to practice the full scope instant method, thereby requiring undue experimentation to discover how to use Applicant's invention, as currently claimed.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the

Art Unit: 1649

predictability or unpredictability of the art and, (8) the breadth of the claims. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d, 1400 (CAFC 1988).

The nature of the invention is the demonstration that within cell-free system, administration of a laminin to beta-amyloid protein in solution caused inhibition of amyloid fibril formation. The art recognizes high insolubility of beta-amyloid protein and its ability to form fibrils *in vitro* as well as *in vivo*. However, the claims, as written, broadly encompass administration of an unreasonable number of peptides, "fragment[s] of a laminin protein" (as in claim 1, for example), while, as opposed to the claims, what is disclosed about fragments of laminin is narrow: description of specific binding polypeptide sequences (SEQ ID NO: 1-11, as specifically recited in claim 15) and no other obvious specific functions with no prior art molecules which are closely related in structure.

The standard of an enabling disclosure is not the ability to make and test if the invention worked but one of the ability to make and use with a reasonable expectation of success. With respect to claim breadth, the standard under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, entails the determination of what the claims recite and what the claims mean as a whole. In addition, when analyzing the enablement scope of the claims, the teachings of the specification are to be taken into account because the claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation that is consistent with the specification (see MPEP 2111 [R-1], which states that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation

"During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given *>their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims

Art Unit: 1649

during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550- 51 (CCPA 1969)".

As such, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed method with respect to the "fragment of a laminin protein" is one of a peptide fragment as short as one amino acid. The instant specification fails to provide any guidance on how to practice the instant claimed methods by using any fragment other than the specific binding peptides of SEQ ID NO: 1-11.

While it is not necessary that Applicant understands or discloses the mechanism by which the invention functions, in the instant case, it would appear that Applicant provides a single finding (the finding), and then presents an invitation to experiment and determine what fragments of laminin protein could be effective for the inhibition or reduction of beta-amyloid fibrils.

A patent is granted for a completed invention, not the general suggestion of an idea and how that idea might be developed into the claimed invention. In the decision of *Genentec, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ 2d 100,(CAFC 1997), the court held that:

"[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable" and that "[t]ossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure". The court further stated that "when there is no disclosure of any specific starting material or of any of the conditions under which a process is to be carried out, undue experimentation is required; there is a failure to meet the enablement requirements that cannot be rectified by asserting that all the disclosure related to the process is within the skill of the art", "[i]t is the specification, not the knowledge of one

Art Unit: 1649

skilled in the art, that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute adequate enablement”.

The instant specification is not enabling because one can not following the guidance presented therein and practice the full scope of the claimed method without first making a substantial inventive contribution.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1, 4, 11-12, 15, 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. Claims 1 and 15 are indefinite as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the claims recite cell culture containing beta-amyloid protein. The relationship between beta-amyloid protein and beta-amyloid protein fibrils within the claim is not obvious. Clarification is required.

11. The term "inhibiting or reducing" in claims 1 and 15 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. Until point of reference (a comparison step) is presented within the claim language, the metes and bounds of the limitation cannot be positively determined.

12. Claim 4 is vague and ambiguous for recitation of synthesized laminin or fragment thereof. Unless otherwise defined, all known proteins are synthesized. Clarification is required.

Art Unit: 1649

13. Claim 11 recites the limitation "laminin A chain" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14. Claim 20 recites the limitation "human A chain laminin" in claim 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

15. Claims 12 and 28 are indefinite for being dependent from indefinite claims.

Conclusion

16. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga N. Chernyshev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet L. Andres can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Olga N. Chernyshev, Ph.D.

Application/Control Number: 09/938,275

Page 8

Art Unit: 1649

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1649

January 3, 2006